



# HISTORY OF ANTHROPOLOGY NEWSLETTER

III: 2

1976

## PROSPECTS AND PROBLEMS: VI

For a while, it seemed as if we would in fact publish on a regularly biannual basis. The two numbers of our first volume appeared in 1973 and 1974. After that we seemed to have achieved a winter/summer schedule for the next three numbers. Unfortunately, we have now stretched the interval to the point where even "fall 1976" is scarcely accurate. It is our hope, however, to publish twice a year, and to have each volume appear within a single calendar year, even if the seasons should be slightly out of step. We are sufficiently well established now to be indexed in the annual Critical Bibliography published by Isis, and we will do our best to provide them with continuing material worthy of indexing. All our old appeals for help from our subscribers are still in effect in the meantime.

Renewals and Lapsed Subscribers-- It is our impression that many subscribers have lapsed simply by oversight. To test this assumption, we are sending a postcard to each lapsed subscriber offering the chance to reestablish their subscription and purchase back issues. To avoid this problem in the future, we plan to attach a renewal form to each issue for those whose subscriptions are expiring. Please note again that a red line across the end of your mailing label means that your subscription expires with the red-lined number. To avoid a lapsed subscription, take advantage of the renewal blank.

Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences-- The JHBS, now under the editorship of Dr. Barbara Ross, is anxious to broaden its coverage, both in terms of substance and subscribers. The flyer attached to this number of HAN indicates some recent and forthcoming articles of interest to historians of anthropology. HAN subscribers are encouraged to consider the JHBS as an outlet for high quality articles. Manuscripts should be sent to Dr. Ross, Department of Psychology, University of Massachusetts, Harbor Campus, Boston, Mass. 02125.

Business Office-- Once again, our business office has been moved. All correspondence pertaining to subscriptions and other business matters should be sent to our Secretary-Treasurer, Bob Bieder at P.O. Box 1384, Bloomington, Indiana, 47401.

Back Issues-- The price given in HAN III:1 was incorrect. The correct figure is \$1.50 a copy.

## The Editorial Committee

George Stocking (Editorial Secretary)  
University of Chicago

Robert Bieder, (Secretary-Treasurer)  
Bloomington, Indiana

Robert Berkhofer  
University of Michigan

Regie Darnell  
University of Alberta

Dell Hymes  
University of Pennsylvania

Judith Modell  
University of Minnesota

Timothy Thoresen  
Custavus Adolphus College

Correspondence relating to editorial matters should be directed to  
George Stocking, Department of Anthropology, University of Chicago,  
Chicago, Illinois, 60637, U.S.A.

Correspondence relating to subscriptions and business matters should be  
directed to Robert Bieder, P.O. Box 1384, Bloomington, Indiana, 47401, U.S.A.

(Produced by Linguistic Research, Inc., Edmonton, Alberta, Canada)

## Subscription Rates

Individual subscribers (U.S. and Canada)	\$2.00
Student subscribers (U.S. and Canada)	1.00
Institutional subscribers	3.00
Subscribers outside U.S. or Canada	3.00

(Checks should be made out, in U.S. dollars, to History of Anthropology  
Newsletter.).

## SOURCES FOR THE HISTORY OF ANTHROPOLOGY

I. NINETEENTH-CENTURY ETHNOLOGY IN THE UNITED STATES  
Robert E. Bieder

For several years I have researched the development of early nineteenth-century ethnology in the United States and in particular the image of Native Americans in ethnological writings (Cf. HAN III:1). In my investigations the following archival collections proved extremely valuable, not only for their holdings on the ethnologists who receive major attention in my work (Benjamin S. Barton, Albert Gallatin, Samuel G. Norton, Ephraim G. Squier, Henry R. Schoolcraft, and Lewis H. Morgan), but also for many minor figures who, as members of scientific societies or as informants to the major ethnologists, furthered the development of the science.

For early ethnology the most important source of late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century manuscript material is the American Philosophical Society, whose, A Guide to Manuscripts Relating to the American Indian in the Library of the American Philosophical Society, compiled by John E. Freeman and Murphy Smith (Philadelphia: 1966), greatly facilitates research there.

The A.P.S. collection includes the papers of B. S. Barton, much material on Benjamin Rush and William Bartram, and the only extant Indian vocabulary list of Thomas Jefferson, as well as the correspondence of the linguist Stephen S. DuPonceau which contains references to the Historical and Literary Committee set up by the A.P.S. to collect information on the Indians. The A.P.S. also houses the papers of that curious investigator of Natural History, Constantine S. Rafinesque (225 items), and those of the more important ethnologist S. G. Morton (485 items) for the years 1819-50. Additional Morton papers (6 boxes) covering the years 1799-1851 are located at the Library Company of Philadelphia.

The papers of A. Gallatin, one of the founders of the American Ethnological Society, are deposited at the New York Historical Society. However, a more extensive and accessible collection is the microfilm edition completed under the sponsorship of New York University and the National Historical Publications Commission. A useful work to consult when ordering this microfilm is Carl Prince, Guide to the Microfilm Edition of the Papers of Albert Gallatin (Philadelphia: Rhistoric Publications, 1970).

Other important members of the A.E.S. during this period were E.S. Squier and H. R. Schoolcraft. The papers of both men are scattered across the country. The Huntington Library houses the papers (489 items) relating to Squier's work in Central America from 1852-58 with the Honduras Inter-oceanic Railroad and to his archaeological adventures there. The Squier collection (11 vols., 5 boxes) in the Library of Congress pertains to Squier's archaeological and ethnological studies in Central and South American covering the years 1840-70. The Squier family papers (7 vols., 500 items), covering the years 1816-88 and including many letters from E. G. Squier, are in the New York Historical Society.

The largest collection of Schoolcraft papers (50 vols., 61 boxes, 2 portfolios) are at the Library of Congress and are also available on microfilm. Manuscript materials on Schoolcraft's years as Indian agent and then superintendent in Michigan (1822-41) are in the National Archives and can be obtained on microfilm (Records of the Superintendencies and Agencies of the Office of Indian Affairs. Michigan: 1814-51. M 1, National Archives Microfilm). Two other sources for Schoolcraft material are the Burton Historical Collection of the Detroit Public Library (2 vols., 2,000 items) covering the years 1805-69, and the Huntington Library (129 items) for the years 1815-74. Two key individuals in Schoolcraft's development as an ethnologist are Lewis Cass, whose papers are at the William Clements Library (University of Michigan), and George Johnston, Schoolcraft's part-Ojibwa brother-in-law, whose papers (27 vols.) for the years 1813-62 are at the Burton Historical Collection.

While not a major figure in ethnology, John Russell Bartlett is significant because of his role as one of the founders and officers of the A.E.S. and also as the author of The Progress of Ethnology. His papers (20 vols.) which cover the years 1846-86, are in the John Carter Brown Library (Brown University).

The last major figure in nineteenth-century ethnology with whom I deal is L. H. Morgan. His papers (19,000 pages), including many manuscripts,

are at the University of Rochester. Further Morgan letters can be found in various collections in the State Library of New York, the A.P.S., and in the Smithsonian Archives. Instrumental to Morton's early development as an ethnologist was his contact with the Seneca, Ely S. Parker. Many of Parker's papers can be found in the papers (13 boxes) of his nephew Arthur C. Parker, at the University of Rochester. Other Parker papers (300 items), again donated by A. C. Parker, can be found at the A.P.S for the years 1794-1946, the Huntington Library (125 items) for 1802-94, and at the State of New York, Albany.

Useful in any study of Morgan and Squier are the papers of Joseph Henry, first secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, who maintained an extensive correspondence with both men in regard to their publications with the Smithsonian Institution. Currently, Henry's papers are being published by the Smithsonian under the editorship of Nathan Reingold.

This is not, of course, an exhaustive list of depositories holding materials for the history of early nineteenth-century ethnology. Other vital materials (letters, vocabulary lists, archaeological drawings, etc.) can be found in the American Antiquarian Society, the Boston Public Library, the Newberry Library, and in various state historical society libraries, especially those of Pennsylvania and Massachusetts.

## II. MELVILLE JACOBS PAPERS

The papers of Melville Jacobs (1902-1971), who studied anthropology under Franz Boas and went on to teach anthropology at the University of Washington from 1928 until his death, are in the University of Washington Library. Permission to consult them must be given by a committee of six trustees. Inquiries should be directed by Mr. Richard Berner, Head, University Records and Archives, University of Washington Library, 39th Street and 12th Avenue, N.E., Seattle, Washington, 98195.

## III. SOL TAX ENDOWMENT FUND

The holdings in the history of anthropology in the Department of Special Collections of the University of Chicago Library (cf. HAN II:1) have been recently enriched by a \$30,000 gift from Sol Tax, Professor Emeritus-- whose papers are in the process of transfer to the Library. The money will be placed in the Gertrude and Sol Tax Endowment Fund to help pay for archivists and facilitate publication of materials from the archives. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first endowment specifically directed toward the development of the history of anthropology.

## FOOTNOTES FOR THE HISTORY OF ANTHROPOLOGY

## RADCLIFFE-BROWN, LOWIE, AND THE HISTORY OF ETHNOLOGICAL THEORY: I

For thirty years after its publication in 1937, Lowie's History of Ethnological Theory was the standard American source on the history of what we would today gloss as cultural anthropology. It contains an eight-page discussion of the British social anthropologist A. R. Radcliffe-Brown, as well as numerous additional references to his work. Lowie, who had reviewed the Andaman Islanders quite favorably in 1923-- although treating it as a descriptive account rather than as a contribution to theory-- was in some respects the old-line Boasian closest to Radcliffe-Brown, in terms of his continuing interest in a scientifically oriented study of social organization. Even so, Lowie echoed a common Boasian reaction to Radcliffe-Brown's six-year attempt to propagate social anthropology in the United States: what was proclaimed as true was simply programmatic platitude, and what was in fact true was much like what the Boassians had been doing all along.

Radcliffe-Brown made no attempt to answer Lowie directly in print, but he did write a long and somewhat irate letter, in which he focused on two issues: the consistency of his position over time, and the difference in assumption between himself and the Boassians. Although the precise degree of diachronic consistency in Radcliffe-Brown's theoretical viewpoint is an historical issue that needs further investigation, this quite fascinating letter offers valuable material on his early years as an anthropologist, his own sense of the stability of his theoretical viewpoint, his psychological interests, and on some of the very real differences that marked the Radcliffe-Brownian from the Boasian approach. Also interesting is what Radcliffe-Brown chose not to respond to in the first six pages of Lowie's discussion, which interested readers may wish to consult.

The letter is published with the gracious permission of Mrs. Cynthia Pike of London, England, and the Director of the Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley. (G.W.S.)

Dear Lowie,

6 May 1938

The students of my seminar have asked me to explain how it is that you give such a distorted account of my views in your new book. So I have just read the section devoted to me and feel impelled to write to ask you two questions.

The first is why you suggest in a number of passages that I have recently changed my opinions on several points?

1. page 237. "this .... is now freely conceded by R.B." So far as I am aware my views on the nature of the unity

(consistency or congruity of parts) of a social system are not in any important way different from what they were in 1909 or even 1905. Moreover the idea as I now hold it and as I have held it for a long time is not a new one but has been a commonplace of social science ever since it was first expressed by Montesquieu.

2. page 227. "R.B. now overtly recognizes study of the individual" page 230. "R.B.'s recent inclusion of the individual as a legitimate object of enquiry." In the Andamans in 1906-8, as many people know, I carried out systematic investigations on individuals, having taken with me a full equipment for experimental psychology. It is true that I have not published and shall never publish my observations. They were part of a systematic investigation of variability, in physical characters (anthropometric measurements, hair etc.) in physiological characters and in mental character (sense-acuity, illusions, reaction-time, pain, colour vision, emotional type etc.) I do not think that any anthropologist had at that date ever done what I did, namely collect and record the dreams of a number of individuals with the aim of determining variability of type. I gave a paper at Cambridge before I went to the Andamans on the study of individual variability in communities of different type, and presented a sketch of my results in 1909. This particular part of my work was not relevant to the subject of my book and so was not included.

From 1901 when I began my four years work in a psychological laboratory and in a psychiatric clinic to 1934 when I was President of the Chicago Society for Individual Psychology, I have never ceased to be a psychologist. As such I think that a good deal of the work at present being done on individuals in non-European communities is thoroughly unscientific.

Moreover my students know that I have always taught (1) that the function of a social institution can only be seen in its effects in individuals (2) that the only data of social anthropology are observations of acts of behaviour (including speech) of individuals or products of such acts and (3) that culture is something that exists only in an individual. One of my criticisms of those who belong to the Boas tradition is that they talk about culture acting on individuals and individuals acting on culture, which seems to me pure nonsense. Individuals act on individuals and on materials. If anthropologists would only come down out of that cloud-cuckoo land where 'culture-traits' and 'culture-complexes' and 'patterns' and 'configurations' diffuse, move about, spread (whether on wings or feet I know not) act and interact, and realise that what they ought to deal with are actual human individuals and their relations I should hail that revolution with joy. It is one I have been working for all my life, but I fear it will not come about.

3. Page 227 line 4. "R.B.'s present position." Again the implication, the suggestion, that I am a shifting or even shifty sort of person. In 1905 I wrote a long essay on the use of the concept function in science (physiology, psychology, sociology)

It was part of a work on scientific method which I was preparing as a fellowship thesis and which was never completed because I went to the Andamans. My views on function as then written down are in all important respects identical with those written down thirty years later. There may be slight differences of phraseology. See, for instance the definition of social function on page 234 of the Andaman Islanders which was written about 1909.

4. page 227 line 6 from bottom "historical explanations are now regarded as complementary to those of the functionalist order." Again an innuendo that I have shifted my position.

Here I ask my second question. Why do you misrepresent my views by entirely excluding any reference to what I have written about ethnology? Since you seem to have read some of my writings an impartial reader would certainly conclude that your misrepresentation is deliberate. I gather from reports that this is the impression that your book has made on some persons and that your action is attributed to personal spite or personal dislike. Your book proclaims itself as concerned with ethnology. You are perfectly aware that I regard ethnology as a purely historical study and that I distinguish it from sociology or social anthropology and that my views on this subject have been in print since 1923. You know also that the same distinction is made by a great number of other anthropologists not only in England and France but also in America (e.g. Refield) No one in England would dream of calling Balfour a social anthropologist or Frazer or Durkheim an ethnologist. You may yourself prefer to muddle together what others distinguish as ethnology, social anthropology and psychology and call the fantastic mixture ethnology but in writing about other people you have absolutely no right to attribute to them the same love of muddle and ambiguity and to misrepresent their views by deliberately ignoring something which is fundamental in all their thinking, writing and teaching. If this is not dishonesty on your part I wish you would tell me what it is.

I have taught ethnology as a history of peoples including not only the history of 'culture' or civilisation but also racial history, archaeology, and history of language for fifteen years in Cape Town, Sydney, and Chicago. (Fred Eggan now carries on the Chicago course, Elkin the Sydney course, and Schapera the Cape Town course) If you do not know this you know singularly little of my work. In any case you have only to turn to pages 407 to 494 of the Andaman Islanders to find a specifically ethnological treatment of the technical culture of the Andamans, with an exemplification of certain methodological considerations relating to historical reconstruction. Why should you ignore, apparently deliberately, the little that I have published on ethnology, and my own definite statements as to how I conceive that subject?

Page 228. The distinction between what I now call 'synchronic' and 'diachronic' sociological problems and laws was made in my Cambridge lectures in 1910, though I then used the terms 'static' and 'dynamic' which you will find in Rivers 'Social Organisation'. The

distinction is, of course a commonplace of European thought. See, for example Durkheim, *Le Socialisme*, p. 141 and for the terms syn- and dia-chronic de Saussure, *Linguistique générale*. But the making of diachronic generalisations is not history, it is science. it is part of sociology (social anthropology) not of ethnology.

If Elsie Clews Parsons was studying the early records of the Hopi in 1922, I was lecturing in the same year on the history of the native tribes of South Africa. Why drag in this reference to Elsie as though plenty of people had not done that sort of thing before either of us and as though it was not the sort of thing that every competent and conscientious anthropologist would do as a matter of course if he was studying a native people?

In all these passages you employ the method of innuendo (by the use of words now, present, recent) to imply that I have changed my opinions on important points. If this is what you intend people to think why not have the courage and decency to say so outright instead of relying on innuendo? And then why not indicate, at least in a foot-note, some scrap of evidence?

In my lectures on Sociology (not Ethnology) in 1910 I expounded the views I still hold on such matters as the classification of social types, evolution, function, the unity of a social system, etc. Glance at the list of lectures. My work in ethnology has always been carried out entirely independently.

I should like to believe that what you have written about me was written in good faith, but the evidence is against it. Why this extensive use of the method of innuendo? There are other examples. E.G. on page 228 the implied suggestion that I had put forward the distinction between synchronic and diachronic problems as something new. You must have known that what you were suggesting was false. You knew also that one cannot reply to attacks of this sort when made in such a book.

The conclusion you draw seems to be that I do not differ very much from Boas and yourself except that my work is more restricted in scope. You are finding comfort in something that is patently false to everyone else except yourself. There is one absolutely fundamental point in which I differ from Boas and you and have always differed and shall always differ. In common with the great majority of scholars, at any rate in this country, I hold that history and science are different things. In ethnology I try to do history in the same way that reputable historians do it, and in social anthropology I try to do science in the way that physicists and biologists do it. You do neither but wish everyone to muddle history and science together, whereby they become pseudo-history and pseudo-science. Your antagonism to me seems to be due to the fact that I insist on a rigid scientific method in science and a rigid historical method in history. While I am sincerely sorry that this has made an enemy of you I cannot cease to uphold what I believe to be the necessities of good scholarship.

Yours sincerely,

A. R. Radcliffe-Brown

## OLIO'S FANCY--DOCUMENTS TO PIQUE THE HISTORICAL IMAGINATION

## ANTHROPOLOGISTS AND LATE NINETEENTH CENTURY AMERICAN INDIAN POLICY

Frederick E. Hoxie  
Newberry Library

Between 1880 and 1900 American anthropologists, led by the scientists at the Bureau of American Ethnology in Washington, began to organize themselves into a modern profession. During these same two decades the "Indian question" was a prominent political issue, both in the Capital and the West. These years produced the American Anthropological Association and the American Anthropologist, as well as the Dawes Severalty Act, a national Indian school system, and the first large-scale grant of American citizenship to natives. It was a crucial period for both the Washington anthropologists and their native "subjects," but thus far our histories have not often treated the two sets of events in tandem.

The document below reveals three things about Washington anthropologists and government actions in the late nineteenth century. First, for these scholars, there was a connection between theoretical beliefs and public policy. Their evolutionary perspective was consistent with the values and expectations of their society. While the theory was applied differently by different individuals, evolutionism clearly taught that natives were less "civilized" than Europeans, and that scientists should point out where and how "backward" groups might be "raised" to the level of white society. Second, Washington anthropologists who were expert lobbyists for appropriations for their own scientific undertakings were often in touch with government officials who made Indian policy. What is more, these contacts were often made and maintained with Westerners who were eager to dismantle the reservations. And third, their policy recommendations were usually based on extensive investigation and represented what was then uniformly accepted as a thorough and sensitive understanding of the Indian's culture. This last point, of course, should not obscure the fact that this version of evolutionism provided the ideological underpinnings for attacks on both the native land base and tribal cultures.

The excerpt below is taken from the draft of a letter by John Wesley Powell to Senator Henry M. Teller in 1880, shortly after Powell had established the Bureau of American Ethnology. The Colorado Republican, who later served as Secretary of the Interior from 1882 to 1885, had asked Powell to advise him on a proposal to remove the Indians who had been involved in the recent "Ute war" to the Uintah valley in Southeastern Utah. Major Powell endorsed the idea, saying that the new reservation "would make a better home for them than any other valley in Utah or Colorado." In a long addendum Powell turned to the larger issue of the Indian's future in American society and what he felt should be the shape of government policy. Although this argument was eliminated from the final official note to Teller, the Senator seems nonetheless to have acted on Powell's advice. He opposed immediate allotment for the Utes in Utah, but when he became Secretary, and later when he returned to the Senate (he served until 1909), he advocated enlarging government boarding schools and gradually breaking up tribal lands into individual homesteads.

The original is available at the National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. 20560, manuscript #3751. I am grateful to the archives for granting permission to publish this material, and to James R. Glenn for his assistance in verifying my transcription.

[February, 1880]

[To Senator H. M. Teller]

I beg leave to call your attention to other matters which I deem worthy of consideration by yourself and those who are treating with the Ute Indians.

There are two grand steps in the civilization of North American Indians, to take either of which leads to a struggle. All of our Indian troubles have arisen primarily and chiefly from two conditions inherent in savage society. The first is that the land belonging to any Indian clan or tribe is dear to it ... Every spring, creek and river, every valley, hill and mountain as well as the trees that grow upon the soil are made sacred by the inherited traditions of their religion. These are all homes of their gods. When an Indian clan or tribe gives up its land it not only surrenders its home as understood by civilized people but its gods are abandoned and all its religion connected therewith, and connected with the worship of ancestors buried in the soil; that is, everything most sacred to Indian society is yielded up.

Such a removal of the Indians is the first step to be taken in their civilization. Such removal is made necessary by other conditions existing in the rapid settlement of the country by civilized people. From the discovery of this continent to the present time the Indians have never surrendered their primitive homes without a struggle. ... Our Indian wars have never grown out of abuses or frauds in administration, but have invariably grown out of the circumstances above mentioned. Incidents of administration may precipitate a conflict but do not originate it. Wise and just administration can ameliorate the difficulties in this problem to some extent but cannot wholly avoid them.

The great body of Indians of North America has been removed from their original homes. Only a few now remain to worship at the graves of their ancestors. This portion of the problem is almost solved, but the wisdom and patience of the American people must be exercised for a few years longer, demanding as they should on the one hand, that the progress of civilization and the establishment of homes for millions of civilized people should not be retarded because of the interests and superstitions of a small number of savages, yet insisting on the other hand that strict justice and the widest charity be extended to the Indians.

The second great step in the civilization of the Indians consists in inducing them to take lands and property in severalty. The social organization of all the Indians in this country is primarily by clans, each consisting of a body of relatives--a great family peculiarly organized. Indian government is based on kinship as a body of kindred compose a clan; two or more clans compose a

tribe; and tribes are again united and form confederacies, but confederacies and even tribes easily fall to pieces. The only permanently coherent organization is the clan. ...

Ownership to lands in severalty should be looked forward to as the ultimate settlement of our Indian problems and all possible means should be taken to secure this end. But the policy should not be abruptly enforced upon the uncivilized Indians. Time should be given them for the modification of their social and religious opinions and such modification will come chiefly through the acquirement of property and the consequent desire to change their traditional modes of inheritance. It is to be observed among all those tribes which have longest been under the management of the government that the clan gradually falls to pieces and the family as recognized in civilized society is established. With the establishment of the civilized family land in severalty may be given to the Indians. When this step is accomplished, that is, when the Indians have been induced to take land in severalty the Indians as a subject for special legislation and administration will disappear.

The two steps then to be taken in the civilization of the Indians are these: first the Indians must be severed from their native soil; and second, they must be induced to accept the fundamental element in civilized society, namely family organization with the rights in severalty to property.

The first step can and must be taken early in the history of the management of any tribe. The last step must and can only be taken later in such history. It is unwise to undertake both at once. The attempt has often been made but has never succeeded and the difficulties of taking the first step are greatly increased by complications with the second.

...

Among the American people there is no lack of feeling of justice toward the Indian. Everywhere the press advocates it, Congress strives to do justice to the Indians in the enactment of laws, and national administration has ever been earnest in the same object of justice; but there is a profound and inherent difficulty in the matter. That which the Indian demands as justice we will not and do not believe to be substantial justice; while that which we would do for them in the belief that it is just and humane they will not accept believing it to be injustice and crime. These antagonistic opinions grow out of the dissimilar institutions of savage and civilized society. In the settlement of these differences we must be the judges of justice and humanity. In rendering judgement we have sometimes erred in supposing the transaction was merely a financial one: that for so much land we were to pay so much money or its equivalent; but we have taken from the savages something else; we have taken from them the institutions of savagery in snatching from them the very conditions under which these institutions could exist, and in return justice demands that we shall give to them the institutions of civilization. We owe civilization to the Indians of the United States; and this debt can only be discharged by a patient, earnest and thorough training of the Indians in the ways of civilization. ... A policy of brute control and just payment for lands with honest administration of Indian affairs to the extent of observing every treaty and bargain, of

delivering every stipulated blanket and pound of flour discharges but a minor part of the debt we owe. The major portion of that debt can be paid only giving to the Indians Anglo-Saxon civilization, that they may also have prosperity and happiness under the new civilization of this continent.

A CORRECTION:

Professor John Rowe, of the Department of Anthropology, University of California, has written to us correcting two unfortunate oversights in our last installment of *Clio's Fancy* ("The First American Anthropological Association"):

Readers of HAN who also follow the frequent contributions to their subject which appear in the Kroeber Anthropological Society Papers (Berkeley) will not have been surprised to learn that an earlier American Anthropological Association was organized in 1876. They will have read about it in "Anthropological activity in the United States, 1865-1879," by Patricia J. Lyon (KASP no. 40, Spring, 1969, pp. 8-37, especially pp. 20, 22-23). What will surprise them is the editorial comment on p. 9 of HAN III:1 that there is no hint in the pages of the American Antiquarian that this earlier Association had ever existed. Lyon cites Peet's account of the first annual meeting held at Cincinnati on September 6, 1877, in the American Antiquarian, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 47 and 49, and the fact that Peet still listed himself as Corresponding Secretary of the Association in vol. 2, no. 1 (1879) of the same journal.

How delightful, however, to find Peet's printed account of the 1876 organization meeting reproduced in "Clio's Fancy," thus learning more about the earlier Association from a document not available to Lyon.

BIBLIOGRAPHICA ARCANAE

I. THE HISTORY OF ANTHROPOLOGY IN THE KASP

John Rowe's comment stimulated us to run through the Kroeber Anthropological Society Papers for items of interest to our readers. The following somewhat hastily gathered list does not include obituaries or honorific bio-bibliographical notices such as the items on S.A. Barrett (No. 33), A. L. Kroeber (No. 25), E. M. Loeb (No. 35), A. R. Radcliffe-Brown (No. 13), and John Rowe (No. 40). The KASP are of course only one of a number of local Anthropological Society publications in mimeographed form which include historical material of interest to our readers. Readers with easy access to other such publications (e.g., those of Oxford University and the University of Michigan) may be stimulated to submit additional listings.

No. 21 (1959): Donald MacRae, "The British Tradition in Social Anthropology" (1-5)

No. 23 (1960): K.A. Bell Kennedy, "The Phylogenetic Tree: An Analysis of its Development in Studies of Human Evolution" (7-53)

No. 25 (1961): A.D. Krieger, "On Being Critical" (19-24)  
 : D. Collier, "Museums and Ethnological Research" (149-154)  
 : O. Stewart, "Kroeber and the Indian Claims Commission Cases" (181-190)

No. 26 (1962): Dell Hymes, "On Studying the History of Anthropology" (81-86)

No. 29 (1963): John Ingham, "Malinowski: Epistemology and Oedipus" (1-14)  
 : H.A. Levenstein, "Franz Boas as Political Activist" (15-24)

No. 30 (1964): John Rowe, "Ethnography and Ethnology in the 16th Century" (1-20)

No. 31 (1964): R.C. McCone, "Culture Change Theory Implicit in the Writings of A. L. Kroeber" (105-116)  
 : Robert Heizer, "Civil Rights in California in the 1850s: A Case History" (129-137)

No. 32 (1965): J.F. Freeman, "University of Anthropology: Early Departments in the United States" (78-90)

No. 35 (1966): "Humanity: What is It?" (an interview with Claude Levi-Strauss) (41-53)

No. 37 (1967): A.L. Kroeber and Dale Valory, "Ethnological Manuscripts in the Robert H. Lowie Museum of Anthropology" (1-22)

No. 39 (1968): George A Foster, "The Social Anthropological Field Experience" (1-19)

No. 40 (1969): C.W. Meighan, "The Kroeber Anthropological Society, 1949-1969" (1-7)  
 : P.J. Lyon, "Anthropological Activity in the United States, 1865-1879" (8-37)  
 : T.D. McCown, "Teaching Anthropology at Berkeley" (82-92)

No. 42 (1970): C.W. Clellow, Jr. "Some Thoughts on the Background of Early Man, Hrdlička, and Folsom" (27-46)  
 : J.W. Abbott, "Cultural Anthropology and the Man/Environment Relation: An Historical Discussion" (10-31)

No. 48 (1973): P.A. Erickson, "The Indo-European Hypothesis in Nineteenth Century Physical Anthropology" (165-179)

Special Publication No. 3 (1973), The Crisis in North American Archeology ed. A.G. Pastron, et. al., contains Judith Rodden, "The Legal Protection of Antiquities in the British Isles: An Historical Survey" (123-143)

## II. RECENT DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS

Hinsley, Curtis M., Jr. (University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1976) "The Development of a Profession: Anthropology in Washington, D.C., 1846-1903"

Langham, Ian (1976, Princeton) "The Maturing of Social Anthropology at Cambridge: W.H.R. Rivers and his Disciples in the Development of Kinship Studies, 1898-1931." The dissertation examines the efforts of Rivers, Haddon and their Cambridge-educated disciples in developing kinship studies. Crucial episodes in this story were the decipherment of the Ambrym kinship system, and the publication of Radcliffe-Brown's monograph on Australian social organization. The dissertation begins by sketching in the history of kinship studies prior to Rivers. It then launches into a quasi-Freudian account of Rivers' shifting scientific interests, followed by a sociological analysis of the Rivers-Haddon school. The story is complicated by the fact that, circa 1910, Rivers converted to diffusionism, an event which effectively undermined the genealogical phase of his career, and divided his disciples into two camps -- the followers of the earlier, kinship-oriented Rivers, and the followers of the later, diffusionistic Rivers. Detailed discussions are included of Rivers' conversion, and of the "Diffusion Controversy" which followed Rivers' death.

Nichols, Christopher (1975, Brandeis) "The History of Psychoanalytic Anthropology from Freud to Roheim"

Noelke, Virginia H. McK. (1975, University of Texas, Austin) "The Origin and Early History of the Bureau of American Ethnology, 1879-1910"

Schneider, William, (1976, University of Pennsylvania) "The Image of West Africa in Popular French Culture, 1870-1900"

## III. RECENT MASTERS THESES

Careless, Virginia (1976, University of British Columbia) "The Ethnological Society of London, 1843-1871"

Jacknis, Ira (1976, University of Chicago) "Savage Icons: Victorian Views of Primitive Art"

McCracken, Grant (1976, University of Chicago) "The American Anthropologist and his Works: A Study of Lewis Henry Morgan"

Parmentier, Richard (1976, University of Chicago) "An Archeology of E.B. Tylor"

Solie, Ruth (1974, University of Chicago) "James Cowles Prichard: Ethnological Bibliographer"

Watters, David (1976, University of Nevada) "Caribbean Prehistory: A Century of Researchers, Models, and Trends"

## IV. HISTORIA DE LA ETNOLOGÍA

The second volume of Ángel Palerm's useful and interesting history of ethnology has appeared. The first was Historia de la etnología: los precursores (Mexico, 1974), and the next will be Historia de la etnología: los profesionales. The current volume is Historia de la etnología: los evolucionistas, México: Centro de Investigaciones Superiores, Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia, 1976 (paper, 214 pp.). As with the first volume, this consists of a series of short extracts each preceded by a thoughtful introduction by Palerm, with the volume beginning with an insightful general introduction. The first piece is from Ibn Khaldun; otherwise the period covered is from the early 18th century to the beginning of the 20th century. The work is divided into four sections: 'Philosophers of history and political economists'; 'Naturalists and archaeologists'; 'Utopians, sociologists, and socialists'; 'Jurists and ethnologists.'

--William C. Sturtevant

## V. RECENT WORK BY SUBSCRIBERS

(Inclusion here depends primarily on our being notified by the author. Please send full citation, or preferably an offprint.)

Bulhof, Ilse N., "Johan Huizinga: Ethnographer of the Past," Clio: Interdisciplinary Journal of Literature, History and Philosophy 4 (1976) 21-32

Dwyer-Shick, Susan, The Study and Teaching of Anthropology: An Annotated Bibliography. Contains 600 entries from 1848 to April, 1975. Order from The Anthropology Curriculum Project, 107 Dudley Hall, University of Georgia, Athens, Ga., 30602. \$2.00 postpaid.

Fenton, William N. and E.L. Moore, eds., Customs of the American Indians Compared with the Customs of Primitive Tribes by J.F. Lafitau (Toronto, The Champlain Society, 1974) Vol. I of two volumes.

Fogelson, R.F., ed. Contributions to Anthropology: Selected Papers of A. Irving Hallowell (University of Chicago Press, 1976). Contains several of Hallowell's papers in the history of anthropology, as well as biographical material.

Hinsley, Curtis, and Bill Holm, "A Cannibal in the National Museum: The Early Career of Franz Boas," American Anthropologist 78(1976) 306-316.

Murphy, Robert F., "A Quarter Century of American Anthropology," introduction to Selected Papers from the American Anthropologist, 1946-1970 (American Anthropological Association, Washington, D.C. 1976), pp. 1-22.

Nye, Robert A., "Heredity or Milieu: The Foundations of Modern European Criminological Theory," Isis 67 (1976) 335-355.

Stocking, George W., Jr. "Ideas and Institutions in American Anthropology: Thoughts toward a History of the Interwar Period," introduction to Selected Papers from the American Anthropologist, 1921-1945 (American Anthropological Association, Washington, D.C., 1976), pp. 1-50.

In addition to the Murphy and Stocking items noted above, the A.A.A. has republished the Hallowell/Delaguna volume of 1960, Selected Papers from the American Anthropologist, 1888-1920-- all in connection with the celebration of the Association's 75th anniversary.

(For more recent work by subscribers, see the next heading.)

## VI EARLY ANTHROPOLOGY IN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA

The Ethnological Societies of the United States and of Canada have this year each published volumes on the history of their respective national disciplines.

The third volume of the Proceedings of the Canadian Ethnological Society, edited by James Freedman, is entitled The History of Canadian Anthropology, and contains articles by Regna Darnell on "The Sapir Years at the National Museum," by Tom McFeat on "The National Museum and Canadian Anthropology," by Richard Preston on Marius Barbeau, by Richard Salisbury on "Anthropology in Anglophone Quebec," by M.A. Tremblay and Gerald Gold on "L'Anthropologie Dans les Universités du Quebec," and by Sally Weaver on "The Role of Social Science in Formulating Canadian Indian Policy."

The American Ethnological Society Proceedings for 1974, edited by John V. Murra, is entitled American Anthropology: The Early Years, and contains a number of articles on the early phases of ethnology in the United States, as well as on the career of Robert Redfield. Topics treated include the early years of A.E.S., by Bob Bieder and Tom Tax; the early nineteenth century ethnologist Franklin B. Hough, by Arthur Einhorn; anthropology in Washington, 1878 to 1903, by Curtis Hinsley; Daniel Garrison Brinton, by Regna Darnell; Francis La Flesche as native American "informant," by Margot Liberty; fieldwork, archeology, and museum studies in the definition of American anthropology, by John R. Cole; the history of the A.E.S. from 1906 to 1946, by Alexander Lesser; as well as essays by Charles Leslie, Asael Hansen and Milton Singer on aspects of Redfield's work.

## VII ATTRIBUTION OF UNSIGNED MATERIAL IN HAN

John Rowe asked us if items in HAN should not be signed, and we see the point. From now on they will be-- except where authorship is merely a matter of compiling items of information submitted by our readers. For those who like to keep accurate bibliographic data, we offer the following attributions of past material. All "Prospects and Problems" have been by G.W.S., in consultation with the members of the editorial board. All unsigned items in Clio's Fancy and Footnotes to the History of Anthropology have also been by G.W.S.-- with the exception of "Crania and Conscientiousness" (HAN II 2), which was Bob Bieder's.

### RESEARCH IN PROGRESS

Josue V. Harari, Assistant Professor of French, Cornell University has received an A.C.L.S. grant to study eighteenth-century French philosopher-travellers and the origins of ethnological thought.

Mario D. Zamora, Professor of Anthropology at the College of William and Mary, is doing research on "The Founding Fathers of Philippine Anthropology."

### GLEANINGS FROM ACADEMIC GATHERINGS

American Social and Cultural Anthropology, Past and Future: A Conference on the State of the Art-- Organized by Adamson Hoebel and Richard Currier, this conference was held at the Spring Hill Conference Center, Wayzata, Minnesota, October 13-16, 1976. Participants included some thirty "senior" and "junior" anthropologists, chosen respectively from those who got their training prior to World War II and since 1960, as well as a number of invited observers. Papers were circulated in advance and the full proceedings were taped, and one or more volumes are planned.

International Symposium on Quantitative Methods in the History of Science-- Meetings held at Berkeley, California, August 25-27, 1976, covered a wide range of methodological issues of possible interest to historians of anthropology, although there were no substantive papers in our area. There is some possibility that a volume will emerge from the symposium, which was coordinated by Roger Hahn of the University of California Office for History of Science and Technology.

New York Academy of Sciences-- The conference on "The Roots of American Psychology" April 28-30, 1976, included a paper on "Nineteenth Century Origins of the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis," by Dr. James H. Stamm, Upsala College.

Ohio Academy of Science-- The Annual Meeting on April 3, 1976, included a paper on "The Newark Holy Stones-- The History of an Archaeological Episode," by Robert W. Alrutz of Denison University, in a session arranged by Ralph W. Dexter.

Social Science History Association-- The first annual meeting was held at the University of Pennsylvania, October 29-31, 1976. While there were no papers on the history of anthropology, the sessions did include several on the history of the social sciences. The SSHA includes a network of subcommittees in particular research areas, among them CHESM (the Committee on the History and Epistemology of the Sciences of Man), which may be of interest to our readers. For information write Henrika Kuklick, Department of the History of Sociology of Science, University of Pennsylvania.

#### ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Annual Meeting of Cheiron: The International Society for the History of the Behavioral and Social Sciences will take place at the University of Colorado, Boulder, June 9-11, 1977. The deadline for papers will unfortunately probably have passed by the time this HAN reaches subscribers. Those interested in membership in Cheiron should write to Dr. Elizabeth Goodman, 115 West Royal Drive, DeKalb, Illinois, 60115, U.S.A.